

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 14, and 17-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 18, 19, and 20 are amended and no claims have been cancelled. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 17, 18, 19, and 20 are the independent claims.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement that certified copies of all priority documents have been received by the U.S.P.T.O.

Applicants also respectfully note the present action indicates that the drawings have been accepted by the Examiner.

Examiner Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dunn for her time and helpful comments during the telephonic interview of July 16, 2009. During the telephonic interviews, Applicants discussed the art grounds of rejections based on US 2005/0019007 ("Kato").

More specifically, Applicants argued that neither the "playitem" nor the "subplayitem" of Kato were disclosed to include a "PID" of a stream. For example, FIGS. 32 and 40 of Kato respectively show syntaxes of the playitem and subplayitem to include fields for indicating clip information file names but do not show syntaxes to include a field indicating a PID. Therefore, the playitem of Kato is merely able to identify a stream file through the clip information file name but is not able to identify a specific stream among a plurality of streams multiplexed in a stream file. As such, Kato fails to disclose "each of the playitems including a stream indication field indicating the packet identifier (PID) of the transport packets for a reproduction path

among the plurality of reproduction paths,” as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further argued that the Examiner’s newly cited reference U.S. Patent No. 5,517,250 (“Hoogenboom”) also failed to disclose the above limitation of amended claim 1.

The Examiner agreed that amended claim 1 distinguished over the Kato and Hoodgenboom references. As amended independent claims 17-20 are at least somewhat similar to amended claim 1, the art grounds of rejection have been rendered moot. More specifically, claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 14, and 17-29 are patentable over Kato. Hoogenboom also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kato with respect to claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 14, and 17-29. Moreover, Hoogenboom and US 2004/0141436 (“Monahan”), either singly or in combination, fail to remedy the deficiencies of Kato with respect to at least claims 19, 20 and 26-29.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura, at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Neel Patel, Reg. No. 59,452
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/NKP:cfc
NP